U.S. Department of Transportation
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

DOT HS 807 382

November 1987

Final Report

Program Activities Associated with Safety Belt Use Volume I: User's Summary

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear only because they are considered essential to the object of this report.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
DOT HS 807 382		

4. Title and Subtitle	5. Report Date
Program Activities Associated With Safety Belt Use, Volume I, User's Summary v. 1.	November 13, 1987
	6. Performing Organization Code
	8. Performing Organization Report No.
7. Author(s) Jon E. Burkhardt, Jennifer A. Shannon, Hannah Worthington, Mark C. Wozny, and Alan W. Block	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Escosometrics, Incorporated 4715 Cordell Avenue Bethesda, Maryland 20814	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)
	11. Contract or Grant No. DTNH22-86-C-07338
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address National Highway Traffic Safety Administration U.S. Department of Transportation 400 7th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20590	13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report April 1986 - November 1987
	14. Sponsoring Agency Code

15. Supplementary Notes
Dr. Ramon C. "Jesse" Blatt of NHTSA's Office of Driver and Pedestrian Research was the Government Technical Officer on this Contract.

16. Abstract

By the end of 1986, 26 states and the District of Columbia had active safety belt use laws, each supported by a variety of state and community activities. They were not equally successful, as belt-use rates ranged from 23 to 74 percent. To investigate these differences, this study documented the types of activities conducted by the states' implementation programs and identified specific activities at the community level that appeared to be related to higher belt use rates.

The major categories of program activities were community support, employer support, public information and education, media efforts, enforcement, and adjudication. Case studies of eight communities, four with belt use above 50 percent and four with belt use below 50 percent, showed that programs in the higher-use communities maximized media market penetration, tailored and targeted messages to specific subpopulations, and showed higher levels of enforcement of safety belt violations.

Volume 1: User's Summary, provides an overview of the project, descriptions of the program activities reported by the study communities, and a discussion of the activities associated with higher belt use.

Volume 2: Research Report, provides detailed descriptions of the study methodology and results, tabulations of information on state programs, and charts showing activities conducted in case study communities. An appendix provides a review of 12 Model Community Program Safety Belt Projects conducted in non-law or prelaw states.

17. Key Words	18. Distribution Statement
safety belt use safety belt programs safety belt use law	Available to the public through the National Technical Information Service Springfield, Virginia 22161

19. Security Classif. (of this report)	20. Security Classif. (of this page)	21. No. of Pages	22. Price
Unclassified	Unclassified		

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72) Reproduction of completed page authorized

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1 -- INTRODUCTION	1
Methodology	3
Case Study Communities	3
Program Activities	6
Analysis of Differences	7
Findings	7
Report Outline	8
2 -- PROGRAM ACTIVITIES REPORTED BY COMMUNITIES STUDIED	9
Media Efforts	10
Community Support	14
Public Information Education	20
Employer Support	23
Enforcement	28
Relative Frequency of Use of Activities	33
3 -- ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH HIGHER BELT USE	39
Providing Messages for Specific Audiences	39
Maximizing Market Penetration	41
Enforcing Safety Belt Laws	43

1

INTRODUCTION

Promoting safety belt use in passenger cars has been an item on the national agenda for 20 years. Lap belts have been standard equipment on passenger vehicles manufactured in the United States since 1968. The combined lap and shoulder belt has been standard since 1973. Federal funds have been available to states for promoting safety belt use since 1967.

Interest and action has accelerated in the 1980s. Since 1979, states have been required to earmark two percent of their 23 U.S.C. 402 funds for programs to encourage safety belt use. Currently, the use of passenger safety belts is mandated by legislation in over half the states and the District of Columbia.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of the U.S. Department of Transportation contracted with Ecosometrics, Incorporated to analyze program factors associated with safety belt use in states having laws requiring that safety belts be used in automobiles. The basic questions addressed in this study were:

- What program activities have been developed at the community level in those states currently mandating safety belt use?
- What relationship exists between the types and intensities of program activities and the degree of compliance with the laws mandating belt use?

The study collected information about the combinations of activities and the effectiveness of those activities at the community level to assist in the development of new programs and refinement of existing programs. While this study focussed on patterns of association and correlation rather than proofs of causality, the conclusions reached here support the conclusions of similar previous research:[1] the greatest levels of safety belt usage were found in those communities that combined increased levels of enforcement with intense media campaigns. Several additional refinements were added to the previous knowledge. First, it appeared that the most useful measure of enforcement was the per capita conviction rate, which helped express the probability that a citizen might actually pay a fine for not wearing a safety belt; it had a substantially higher statistical association with safety belt usage than citation rate, which indicated the probability of receiving a ticket for belt non-use. Considering the conviction rate rather than the citation rate also underscored the key role of the judicial system in attempts to increase belt usage. Second, media campaigns in high use communities showed careful attention to local details. The media campaigns found in high belt use communities tailored campaigns to the demographic characteristics of the community, focussed on the major employers in the locality, and understood how the local market structure made some media efforts more productive than others in reaching the intended audience.

The purpose of this report is to present and discuss the relationships between community program activities and safety belt use. It is intended for use by state program planners and coordinators to enable them to weigh the probable effects of alternative program designs on safety belt usage rates.

---

[1]For example, see Debra H. Hood, Patricia P. Kraichy, and Jane A. Carman, Selective Traffic Enforcement Program: Final Report, State University of New York at Albany, April 1987; Brian A. Johan, Novey E. Dawson, et al., Evaluation of the Effects of a Selective Traffic Enforcement Program on Seat Belt Usage, Road and Motor Vehicle Traffic Safety Branch, Transport Canada, May 1981; Mike C. Lai and Harold S. Dalkie, "An Evaluation of a Selective Traffic Enfocement Program to Increase Seat Belt Use Rates in Manitoba," Canadian Multidisciplinary Road Safety Conference V: Proceedings, Calgary, Alberta; Grant A. Smith, "Development and Administration of a Community Seat Belt Enforcement and Education Campaign," Technical Memorandum 8001, Road Systems Division, Transport Canada, August, 1980; and Allan F. Williams, David F. Preusser, et al, "Results of a Seat Belt Use Law Enforcement and Publicity Campaign in Elmira, New York," Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Washington, D.C., March 1986.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology for this project included the following steps:

1. Creating an exhaustive list of over 30 potential program activities, based on lengthy conversations with state program administrators,

2. selecting a sample of eight communities:

   - half with belt use over 50 percent, half with belt use under 50 percent;
   - geographic, demographic, and programmatic variations,
   - all with penalties for not using safety belts in effect for at least six months (i.e., the "maintenance phase"); and
   - all having available community level belt use data before and after time of the penalty;

3. collecting information about individual activities from the major providers of each activity (not just from program administrators), mostly by telephone and sometimes by on-site conversations, and

4. analyzing the differences between the high use and low use groups by comparing the activities of the group of communities with high recorded belt use to those of the group of communities with low recorded belt use in terms of participation, audience size, frequency, and time frame.

CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES[1]

The four communities in the higher belt use group were similar to those in the lower belt use group on many demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. The communities selected varied in terms of safety belt program features, such as program funding, length of law's implementation, and distribution of primary and secondary law enforcement states. Among these communities, the differences between higher and lower belt use could not be ascribed to demographic, socio-economic characteristics or other program features mentioned directly above. Similarities between the higher and lower belt use communities are shown in Table 1-1.

---

[1]A heightened degree of participation in this study was obtained by the assurance of anonymity to all participants. Therefore, specific communities will not be identified at any point.

Table 1-1

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HIGHER BELT USE GROUP AND THE LOWER BELT USE GROUP OF CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

Community and Program Characteristics	High Use Communities	Low Use Communities
Demographics		
Total Population	412,871	403,038
Range of Population	35,000 - 258,000	37,000 - 137,880
Income Level	3 communities < state median 1 community > state median	4 communities < state median
Educational Level (percent of the population that graduated from high school)	1 community < state percent 1 community = state percent 2 communities > state percent	3 communities < state percent 1 community = state percent
Significant Minority Population	1 community with large Hispanic population	1 community with large Hispanic population
Geographical Region	1 community in Northeast 1 community in West 1 community in Mid-West 1 community in South	1 community in Northeast 1 community in West 1 community in Mid-West 1 community in East
Program Characteristics		
Major Grants[1]	1 community	2 communities
No Local Program Coordination	2 communities	2 communities
Local Coordination by State Representative	1 community	
Aspects of the Safety Belt Law		
Primary Enforcement	2 communities	2 communities
Secondary Enforcement	2 communities	2 communities

[1]"Major grants" ranged from model community grants of approximately $40,000 to grants that paid for a program coordinator and some administrative help.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

High Belt Use Communities

The four communities in the higher use group each recorded safety belt use over 50 percent, ranging from 51 percent to 77 percent. The four together included a total population of 412,871. Their individual population totals ranged from 35,000 to 258,000. One community was in the Northeast, one in the South, one in the West, and one in the Mid-West. Two of the communities were from the same states as a community in the lower use group. All but one had median household incomes lower than their state median; the fourth community median was only dollars higher than its state median. Two of the four communities had a higher percentage of high school graduates than their state as a whole. One had nearly the same percentage as its state and one had a slightly lower percentage of graduates than its state. One community had a substantial Hispanic population.

One community had in the past received a model comprehensive community grant and the grant task force continued to provide program coordination after the grant's termination. In one community, a district representative of the state highway traffic division served as the local program coordinator. In the other two communities, there was no organized coordination of local safety belt program activities.

Two of the communities were in states with primary enforcement of the safety belt laws and two were in states with secondary enforcement.

Low Belt Use Communities

The four communities in the lower use group each recorded safety belt use under 50 percent, ranging from 19 percent to 36.4 percent. The four together included a total population of 403,038. Their individual population totals ranged from 37,000 to 137,000. All four communities had populations with median household incomes lower than their state medians. Three of the communities had lower percentages of high school graduates than their state percentages and one had the same as its state's percentage. One community included a large Hispanic population. One community was in the Northeast, one in the West, one in the Mid-West, and one in the East.

Two communities had major safety belt program grants and two communities had no organized local program coordination. Two communities had safety belt use laws with primary enforcement and two had use laws with secondary enforcement.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Over 30 program activities were systematically examined and analyzed in five program categories. Some were measured only in terms of participation versus non-participation; others were also measured in terms of intensity of activity. The five major categories of activities examined were:

- Community Support: For the purposes of this study, community support was defined as those activities by community workers and leaders which may contribute to creating an atmosphere in which safety belt use is seen as "the thing to do." Community support activities included media appearances, lobbying, and seminars. Besides participation in activities, community support also included the encouragement, prodding, and soliciting of agents to perform community activities.

- Employer Support: This category included activities sponsored by employers (in both the public and private sector) primarily for the benefit of their employees, including employee policies on belt use, internal educational efforts, and specific incentive or disincentive programs.

- Media Efforts: Five activities through each of three media -- newspaper, radio and television -- were examined and analyzed for differences between the high use and low use groups in terms of participation in and intensity of various activities, including public service announcements (PSAs), paid ads, news reports, belt use status in accident accounts, and talk shows. Thirteen newspapers (seven from high use communities, six from low use), 43 radio stations (25 high use, 18 low use), and 31 television stations (17 high use, 14 low use) were contacted from the eight case study communities.

- Public Information and Education Efforts: Public information and education (PI&E) efforts were defined as those using graphic, written, or spoken presentation of educational information to reach both general and specific audiences, such as billboards, signs, brochures, posters, classroom, community presentations, displays, demonstrations, driver's manuals, envelope stuffers, films, or newsletters. PI&E did not include efforts conducted through the use of television, radio, or newspaper.

- Enforcement and Adjudication Efforts: The enforcement and adjudication efforts that were examined included traffic citations for safety belt violations, fines for conviction of safety belt law violations, staffing of enforcement activities, community outreach by officers, belt use status on accident reports, department belt use policy, department belt non-use disincentives, and training of officers and judges.

ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCES

Activities within each of the five program areas -- community support, employer support, media, PI&E, and enforcement and adjudication -- were examined for their ability to explain the level of safety belt usage in a particular community. The analytical techniques used included pattern analysis, Fisher's exact probability metric test, the Chi-square test and the differences of proportions test.

FINDINGS

The examination and analysis of the differences in program activities between communities with high belt use and communities with low use produced two major findings. First, three factors -- the nature and use of the local media market, specific audience types, and local enforcement of belt use laws -- set the high use communities apart from the low use communities.

> A community's ability or willingness to distinguish and target specific audiences or to tailor programs to identified subgroups within the overall population appeared useful in distinguishing high belt use communities from low belt use communities. High belt use communities more often tailored their media programs to fit the demographic influences of language, literacy rates, and special audiences than did low use communities. In high use communities, employees who drove as part of their job were also more specifically targetted. In high use communities, larger shares of the local media market were being reached with safety belt messages by working with media providers for maximum exposure and by devising media campaigns that would intelligently respond to the structural conditions of the local media market.

> Enforcement of safety belt laws was strongly associated with safety belt usage in the communities examined. Rankings of per capita safety belt convictions matched almost exactly the rankings of increases of safety belt usage in each of the communities; conviction rates (the number of citations for safety belt violations resulting in fines divided by the total number of citations) in high belt use communities were substantially higher than in low use communities. To increase belt usage, police need to give safety belt citations and judges need to uphold them.

Second, aside from these three factors, a community's use of one program activity over another activity did not appear to be associated with belt usage rates. These findings are discussed in detail in the following two chapters.

REPORT OUTLINE

Chapter 2 describes the state of the art in safety belt use promotion. It defines and describes the activities that were conducted in the communities in each of the five program areas -- community support, employer support, media, PI&E, and enforcement and adjudication. This chapter then discusses activities in terms of frequency of usage -- activities conducted in nearly all communities, activities conducted in about half the communities, and activities conducted in only a few communities -- thus establishing what might be called a basic level of safety belt use promotion activities that most communities undertake. Chapter 3 describes three activities that were found to be associated with higher belt use and presents observations on how communities might use those findings in building their programs.

2

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES REPORTED BY COMMUNITIES STUDIED

This chapter discusses activities which were used at the community level in programs to promote safety belt use. Activities were classified into five categories: media, public information and education (PI&E), community support, employer support, and enforcement. Each category is discussed here, including an analysis of the usage of the activities in that category. Several activities were statistically associated with higher belt usage communities or communities where belt usage rates had significantly increased; they will be discussed in the next chapter.

Some activities were more widely used than other activities in the communities in this study. (An activity was listed as tried in a community if one or more providers performed that activity.) Not all activities were observed in every community. Some activities were done in most communities, some in about half the communities, and a few were done in only a small number of the communities. Tabulations of activities by frequency are provided at the end of the chapter.

The participation or non-participation in any particular activity had several possible causes. An activity might have been so entrenched or effortless that stopping it would have freed few resources for other projects. The activity might also have been needed in the community or needed to establish a base from which other activities developed. For activities conducted in only some or a few of the communities, a reevaluation on a community-by-community basis might have led to program changes that could have increased the effective

allocation of resources and efforts for local safety belt promotion programs. In some cases, though, the choice of an uncommon activity represented a coordinator's decision to develop a program for specific populations, which took into account demographic characteristics such as minority populations, literacy rates, ages, and major employers in a particular community.

MEDIA EFFORTS

Media activities encompassed five activities: public service announcements (PSAs), paid ads, news stories, belt wearing status in accident accounts, and talk shows. Television and radio stations performed all five activities while newspapers did everything but talk shows.

Types of Activities

PSAs

PSAs for television and radio ranged from five-second simple messages of buckle-up to 60-second nationally produced and distributed announcements. The content ranged from information about the law to emotional appeals and direct requests for safety belt use. Television and radio PSAs included the Vince and Larry series and radio PSAs included emotional pleas of Barbara Mandrel and "Tracey's Song." (Vince and Larry are the talking crash dummies who recommend safety belt use in materials produced by NHTSA and designed by the National Advertising Council. Tracey's Song was composed by the father of a teenager killed in a car accident and details the future she will miss.)

PSAs used on the radio ranged from nationally-produced spots to unrehearsed messages by disk jockeys formulated from press releases from local area programs. PSAs were aired most often just before and just after passage of the law mandating safety belt usage. Many PSAs were produced for one locality and then distributed through a state or region if the PSA gained popularity. Some radio stations reported using them as often as twice a day, while others used them only several times a week or less often. Radio PSAs also included the quick buckle-up message delivered by the D.J. following a traffic report.

Newspaper PSAs often came from National Advertising Council Campaign materials. The Vince and Larry ad series was often used by newspapers as their PSAs.

Paid Ads

Paid ads used on radio and television were generally sponsored by car dealerships and sometimes insurance companies. They coincided with the dealership's commercial promotions. They usually were used for a specified time period during a particular sales campaign. One community received an experimental grant for a pilot program to conduct a paid ad campaign on the radio. Only one newspaper reported using a paid ad; this particular ad was produced as part of a sales campaign by a car dealership.

News Stories

News stories were presented in local newspapers and on radio and network television and most often included reports on the formulation, debate, and passage of the legislation and on its enforcement. In several communities, reporters had their own "saved by the belt" experience or other reasons for deep personal commitment to promoting safety belt use. In other cases, the community task force had established regular communications with various media contacts. The task force or coalition often kept in contact with the separate reporters who covered accidents and the reporters who covered health and safety issues in addition to editors who determined paper or station policy. That communication channel included press releases, newsletters, and PI&E packets, and often involved direct contact by the program coordinator or a task force member.

Safety belt wearing had the greatest exposure as the laws were legislated and put into effect. Sometimes a week-long series of articles or a 5-10 minute television segment was used to describe the law and its enforcement. Local television network affiliates tended to include safety belt news during the local news segments, which often varied in length and content depending on the community. Radio news time was generally limited and less dependent on direct local reporting. Newspapers with a section devoted to local events provided a popular vehicle for safety belt news. News stories were rare after the initial period when the law was enacted and generally occurred only when the community took stock of its efforts on the anniversary of the passage of the law or when the community created a media event such as a community-wide "safety belt challenge."

Belt Use Status in Accident Accounts

Belt use status was included in accident accounts reported in all three media -- newspaper, radio, and television. The inclusion of safety belt status in an accident account often depended on the policies of the newspaper or station and the accessibility of belt status information. The paper or station might have, as a matter of policy, reported only fatalities, only serious accidents, or all of them. A general policy was for them to include belt use status for those accidents they did report and for which information was available. Accessibility to belt use status information was dependent on police department policy. Reporters for the various media appreciated accident accounts that mentioned the degree of injuries or number of deaths due specifically to not wearing safety belts.

Talk Shows

Radio and television talk shows focused on the legislation that made safety belts mandatory. Safety belts were first a topic when talk show guests debated the pros and cons of laws that made them mandatory. Coverage of the law's enactment and enforcement was left mostly to news programs. Occasionally, safety belts aired as a topic with the passage of the law itself or the anniversary of the law. Additionally, when appearing on talk shows, enforcement officials often mentioned safety belt benefits and statistics.

Radio and television talk shows on safety belts did not air frequently due to the effort and resources required. Many television and radio programming people considered talk shows about safety belts as one-time only events. Television talk shows tended to occupy half-hour slots while radio talk shows typically lasted 15 minutes.

Analysis

Of the 14 basic media activities, nine were performed in most communities, three were used in about half the communities, and one was done in a few communities. Table 2-1 gives the exposure of safety belt information provided by the various media. Responses from 13 newspapers, (seven in higher use communities, six in lower use), 43 radio stations (25 higher use, 18 lower

use), and 31 television stations (17 higher use, 14 lower use) were accumulated. Higher belt use communities were compared to lower use communities in terms of participation in each activity, audience size, frequency, and time frame. There were no significant differences between the higher and lower use communities in terms of which activities were used or in terms of how the activity was conducted, how frequently or whether or not it was conducted during the maintenance phase. Two media activities did show up as significantly different between lower and higher communities: maximizing market penetration, and tailoring and targeting messages to specific audiences. These measures will be described in the next chapter.

Table 2-1

SAFETY BELT INFORMATION PROVIDED BY VARIOUS MEDIA

Activity	Relative Usage by Media Type		
	Newspapers	T.V. Stations	Radio Stations
PSAs	**	***	***
Paid Ads	*	**	**
News Stories	***	***	***
Accident Accounts	***	***	***
Talk Shows		**	***

Key:

***	Activities performed in most communities
**	Activities performed in about 1/2 of communities
*	Activities performed in few communities
[blank]	Activities not performed

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Community support activities were media appearances, directives, coalition (or task force) membership, lobbying, attending seminars, distributing materials, serving as role models, and donating time or money. Leaders in the community such as politicians, entertainment/sports figures, and news reporters helped safety belt publicity by media appearances, acting as role models, and donating time and resources.[1] Public interest groups, churches, local auto clubs and many other groups listed on Table 2-2 also contributed to community support activities. Table 2-2 combines information from all eight study sites to provide an overall summary of actors and activities providing community support for increased safety belt usage. Four activities that were often the focus of community support activities -- local coalition membership, lobbying, seminars, and "saved by the belt" testimonials -- are explained in more detail below. Discussions of the sources of support -- politicians, public interest groups, churches, the medical community, automobile-related people, and entertainers and sports figures -- follow the discussion of activities.

Types of Community Support Activities

Distributing Materials

Distribution of materials encompassed many of the possible agents examined in community support. The Red Cross and Auto Club produced much of their own campaign material and distributed it to many organizations who then distributed the material to individuals. Driver education instructors and physicians usually received material from local coalitions, task forces, enforcement officials, and service clubs, who had received the materials from larger unbrella organizations. Other small distribution points included organizations like Chambers of Commerce, rental car agencies, and auto sales and repair shops.

---

[1] In particular, law enforcement officials made substantial contributions of volunteer time, especially to participate in safety demonstrations and other coalition/task force activities.

Table 2-2: COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AT CASE STUDY SITES

Possible Agents for Activities	Community Support Activities						
	Distributing Materials	Media Appearances	Issuing Directives	Coalition (Task Force) Membership	Attending Seminars	Lobbying	Saved by the Belt
Political Leaders	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Entertainment/Sports Figures	X	X					X
News Reporters	X	X			X		X
Public Interest Groups	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Churches		X	X	X			
Auto Clubs	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Local Service Clubs			X	X	X		
Chambers of Commerce							
Insurance Companies	X	X		X	X	X	
Medical Personnel	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Driver Education Instructors	X		X	X	X		
Auto Sales and Service People	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rental Car Personnel	X						

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Local Coalition Memberships

Local coalitions or task forces had originally been supported in part by grant monies. Their structure was often formal, including subcommittees and specific jobs for various members. The American Red Cross and a county public health department had been the grant recipients in the three communities with local coalitions. Coalitions coordinated community and high school safety belt challenges, employer support efforts, public demonstrations and displays, educational efforts for school children, and sometimes even coordinated the community's belt usage observational surveys. Coalition members included politicians, representatives of public interest groups, such as MADD, National Safety Council, and the PTA, corporate representatives, people in automobile-related positions (such as driver education instructors and car dealers), doctors and nurses, police officers, and, in one case, a court official. In two communities, police officials had wanted to recruit judges and other adjudication officials into the coalition to help carry out the enforcement of safety belt violations. The two particular communities had a high level of safety belt violations which judges had dismissed.

Lobbying

Many individuals lobbied in support of passage of their state safety belt law. Those involved in lobbying the legislature included local politicians, driver education instructors, insurance company representatives, doctors, nurses, and police officers.

Seminars

Safety belt seminars generally involved various providers of community support, including police officers, coming together for a series of half- or one-day workshops and discussions. Sometimes safety belt use was only one topic on an agenda that also included drunk driving and/or child safety seat uses. The timing of the seminars was usually shortly before or after passage of the safety belt law and the content included information on the law and its enforcement. Seminars at other times had more of an injury prevention or health and safety focus.

"Saved-by-the-Belt" Testimonials

"Saved by the belt" testimonials came from two types of sources in this study. In one case, candidates for making "saved by the belt" statements were identified at accident sites by police officers. In the other, "saved by the belt" dinners were held in various corporate settings.

Analysis of Community Support Activities

Community support activities were often provided by auto-related persons and the medical community of their own volition. Assessing the strength of that existing commitment by the medical community and those in automobile-related industries, plus entertainers and sports figures, was a step toward increasing community support. Another step was to investigate the existence of information-dissemination mechanisms such as a federation of churches. An additional consideration was the fact that the seminars and lobbying efforts reported revolved around either passage of or elements of the legislation.

Of the seven basic community support activities listed in Table 2-2, one was performed in most communities, five were done in about half of the communities, and one was done in only a few instances. Table 2-3 shows these activities as well as the supporters of the different activities done in the communities. Of the five types of supporters of community activities, two were found in most communities and three in about half the communities. For each of the eight communities, responses from program coordinators (or other persons able to give an overview in communities without coordinated programs) were analyzed. The analysis for these activities involved a visual examination of the differences in patterns of participation vs. non-participation in the eight activities between high and low use communities. No specific kind of activity was more likely to occur in higher use communities than in lower use communities.

Supporters in the Communities

Politicians

Politicians, particularly mayors and sheriffs, appeared eager to support safety belt use to their constituents. Most often that support was provided through media appearances.

Table 2-3

COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES OBSERVED

Activities and Supporters	Relative Frequency
Activities	
Distributing Material	**
Media Appearances	***
Issuing Directives	**
Local Coalition Memberships	**
Lobbying	**
"Saved by the Belt" Testimonials	*
Attending Seminars	**
Supporters	
Automobile-related People	**
Churches, Entertainers and Sports Figures	**
Medical Community	**
Politicians	***
Public Interest Groups	***

Key:

*** Activities performed or supporters found in most communities

** Activities performed or supporters found in about half of the communities

* Activities performed or supporters found in a few communities

[blank] Activities not performed or supporters not found

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Public Interest Groups

Public interest groups, such as Mothers Against Drunk Drivers (MADD), Students Against Drunk Drivers (SADD), Remove Intoxicated Drivers (RID), the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), Rotary Club, the Kiwanis Club, the National Safety Council, and the Homemakers Club, provided support in most communities. That support often involved distributing materials produced by the organization itself or produced by a large umbrella organization and then filtered down to the community.

Churches, Entertainers and Sports Figures

Some types of providers of community support were thought by program coordinators to be the most likely people and groups to have access to segments of the population which were difficult to reach otherwise. Those providers included churches, entertainers, and sports figures. In some communities, program coordinators were able to tap into federations or associations of churches, thereby establishing a central distribution point for safety belt materials to congregations within a regional area. In other cases, representatives of particular churches were already established as contacts in the community on other social issues and therefore presumed approachable and reliable for distributing safety belt material. In one case, a church official participated in a PSA. Entertainers providing community support included national figures such as Barbara Mandrel, whose emotional plea for belt use after her highly publicized car accident was replayed on the television news in several communities. Locally known radio and television personalities and several newspaper reporters also made special media appearances, beyond their usual media capacity, to support safety belt use in the community. Sports figures offering support included a football star from a professional team in a nearby urban area. Entertainers and sports figures initiated and executed their support activities without much, if any, outside coordination.

Automobile-Related People

Representatives of the American Automobile Association (AAA), car insurance companies, car dealerships, and rental car companies, along with driver education instructors, provided community support through media appearances and

material distribution in about half the case study communities. Some insurance companies and auto clubs included their own safety belt promotion materials as envelop stuffers with policy and membership renewal notices respectively. Car dealers sold cars that included "Buckle-Up" stickers on the dashboard from the factory. One dealership included safety belt use in their customer representative's presentation on specific features of their car for new owners. Major rental companies were including a message informing people about the law on rental car contracts in those states having laws requiring belt use and sometimes provided written materials at the rental counter.

Driver education instructors often included pro-safety belt messages to their students, sometimes distributed a whole packet of materials to their students, and occasionally sent materials home to the students' families.

Medical Community

Although not reported in all case study communities, the involvement of doctors and nurses was extensive for those communities where it was reported. Private physicians, particularly pediatricians, displayed brochures and posters, issued "prescriptions" for safety belt use, and made personal appearances on radio and television shows, at shopping malls and fairs and other places where they could deliver their message. Emergency room personnel made particularly poignant statements which were captured on radio and television and in the paper.

PUBLIC INFORMATION EDUCATION (PI&E)

Various forms of PI&E were combined to form nine activity categories for examination: billboards and signs, brochures and posters, gimmicks, classroom presentations, community displays and demonstrations, driver's manuals, envelope stuffers, films and newsletters. Responses from the program coordinators or others able to give an overview in communities without coordinated programs were tabulated for the study.

Specific PI&E Activities

Billboards, Signs

The posting of billboards and signs carrying a "buckle-up message" were reported posted in rest areas, along county highways, and at local high schools. In one community, a community buckle-up message was created on marquees at local businesses where the marquee boards reached an estimated 10,000 people in a one week period. Other techniques were estimated to have reached audiences of about 500 persons per week.

Brochures, Posters

Brochures and posters were produced and distributed by local, state, and national organizations. They included titles such as "Fairy Tales," "No Time to React," "Myths and Facts" and the American Red Cross's "Buckle-Up." They were distributed through the Red Cross, neighborhood groups, the welcome wagon, health clinics, doctors' offices, Kiwanis and Rotary clubs, and local businesses and churches. Estimates of audience size generally ranged from 30 at local meetings to 200 on counters at local business. It was reported that from four to ten posters were being placed in buildings of cooperating corporations, banks, hotels, and health departments. Doctors also were willing to place posters in their offices. Some posters included original drawings by children in the community. The Vince and Larry posters from NHTSA were also mentioned.

Gimmicks

Gimmicks that included bookmarks, coloring books, key chains, litter bags, placemats, "prescriptions", and stickers were distributed at safety fairs and local malls by the same groups that produced brochures and posters. Audiences estimates for the different distribution points ranged from 20 at a local nursery school to 150 at a local business to thousands of health fairs, craft shows, and through doctor's offices and local service groups.

Classroom Presentations

Presentations to school children from nursery school to high school ranged from "Buckle-Up Buddy" and a robot advocating safety belt use, funded by McDonalds Restaurants, to presentations by state troopers, task force members or driver education instructors. Various props and speakers were used to cover whole school districts so that each student was generally exposed only once to the presentation but continued to be exposed to materials left in the classroom from the presentation. These were almost always local efforts with curriculum guidance and occasional packets provided to the local schools by the State Office of Education.

Community Displays/Demonstrations

Presentations usually involved a fold-up table top display for use at fairs and in malls. Those had almost always been created with funds from a grant. Some of the same speakers and props used in the school presentations were also part of many community presentations. Another popular prop at fairs and malls and other crowded places was The Convincer, a crash impact simulator. A person sitting in the simulator, using a fastened safety belt, travels at a few miles an hour and suddenly stops as in an accident. The estimated audiences ranged from 50 at meetings to 5,000 at fairs.

Driver's Manuals

Specific techniques included materials in the State driver's manuals and other driver licensing or renewal materials, a question on the safety belt law on the driver's test, materials such as brochures on the counter where new and renewing drivers were processed, or posters on the wall nearby.

Envelope Stuffers

Envelope stuffing appeared in two communities. In one case it was material sent with paychecks to employees in a public agency. The audience was all paid public employees and the frequency was irregular. In the other case, material was stuffed in with license renewals. In that case, all those people in the community renewing their licenses during the year received some safety belt material at least once.

Films

Films were generally used with school children in preschools, high schools and after school activities. Sometimes they were used by employers. "Room to Live" was one film reported by title. The AAA and state police tended to use films in their school and community presentations. Audience size was estimated at between 15 and 150 per sitting.

Newsletters

Newsletters were sent to the community leaders and activists. Some were mailed monthly, others quarterly. Two included summaries of safety belt use and/or safety belt citation statistics. They were only reported in communities with a program coordinator.

Analysis

Of the nine basic PI&E activities, eight were performed in some communities, and one was done by only a few communities. Table 2-4 shows the relative exposure to safety belt information provided by public information and education efforts. The analysis for PI&E involved a visual examination of the differences in patterns of use or non-use of these nine categories of vehicles for delivering PI&E between high use and low use communities. There were no apparent differences in choices of one PI&E activity over another.

EMPLOYER SUPPORT

Employer support activities fell into two separate groupings of providers: corporate employers and government employers. Government employers included enforcement agencies. Employer support activities were setting policies and guidelines providing internal education, offering incentives for use, and establishing disincentives for non-use.

Table 2-4

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES SUPPORTING SAFETY BELT USE

Activities	Relative Usage
Billboards, signs	**
Brochures, posters	**
Gimmicks	**
Classroom Presentations	**
Displays and Demonstrations	**
Driver's Manual	**
Envelope Stuffers	*
Films	**
Newsletters	**

Key:

***	Activities performed in most communities
**	Activities performed in about 1/2 the communities
*	Activities performed in few communities
[blank]	Activities not performed

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Types of Employer Support Activities

Incentive Programs

Most of the incentive programs described in communities who had them were generally simple and straightforward. Program techniques ranged from observing employees as they entered the parking lot, to a lottery of self-proclaimed safety belt users, to signatures on buckle-up pledges. Incentives included savings bonds, prizes donated by local merchants, certificates, and free lunches. Employers involved included electric companies, a paint manufacturing company, and a car manufacturer.

Disincentives

In nearly all the case study communities, several private sector employers used disincentives to belt non-use. Those included threats, such as "disciplinary action," assignment to a review board, or termination of employment. The disincentives were generally communicated in tandem with the belt use policy and usually had been in force as long as the policy itself. However, actual enforcement procedures were seldom explicitly stated.

For government employers, disincentives for not wearing a safety belt usually manifested themselves in the form of a statement in the agency's written belt use policy promising disciplinary action. No specific tracking of the enforcement of the disincentives was reported. Public sector employer disincentives went further than public sector policies. Public sector policies included threats of disciplinary action, assignment to a review board, or termination of employment. Enforcement policies were vague for both public and private sector employers.

Belt Use Policy

In most communities, there were public and private sector employers that required employees to wear a safety belt when operating company cars. That policy most often was written, rarely was it simply a verbal edict. The policy usually was communicated to employees through the employee manual, sometimes

through a fleet operations booklet and periodically through memos, often precipitated by an accident involving the particular organization in some way. Some employers had policies since the 1960's or 1970's; others had only recently made safety belt wearing a requirement for car use.

Internal Education

Various methods of educating employees to the importance of safety belt benefits were used by public and private sector employers in most of the case study communities. Those methods included films, "The Convincer," seminars, signs in the parking lots, stickers, posters, newsletters, memos, paycheck stuffers, and employee driving courses. Only in the case of the employee driving course did a particular method appear associated with high belt use.

A number of these activities were essentially "one-time" events such as films, the convincer, seminars, and driving courses. Others such as signs, stickers, and posters depended on the employee passing in the right place at the right time in order to be exposed to their message. Others such as newsletters, memos and paycheck stuffers were delivered periodically and directly to the employee. Some activities had been going on for years, while others were more recent additions or inclusions of updated material in an established format.

Analysis of Employer Support Activities

Of the eight basic employer support activities, five were performed in most communities, two were conducted in about half the communities, and one was done by only a few communities. Table 2-5 gives the participation figures for employer support. Responses from 14 private sector employers (seven from high use communities, seven from low use) and 14 public sector employers (seven high use, seven low use), were analyzed by comparing high use communities to low use communities in terms of participation in each activity, key activity descriptors, audience size, frequency and time frame. There were no significant differences between the high use and low use communities in terms of the set of activities chosen or how frequently or how many years the activities had been conducted. There was one significant difference in terms of the content of the internal education efforts: employee driving courses were included by significantly more employers in high use than in low use communities. This will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

Table 2-5

EMPLOYER ACTIVITIES SUPPORTING SAFETY BELT USE

Activity	Relative Usage by Employer Type	
	Corporate	Government
Policies and Guidelines	***	***
Internal Education	***	***
Incentives for Use	**	*
Disincentives for Non-Use	***	**

Key:

***	Activities performed in most communities
**	Activities performed in about 1/2 of communities
*	Activities performed in few communities
[blank]	Activities not performed

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Besides the discovery of that one difference, it was found that organizations most likely to be engaged in safety belt promotion have some common characteristics whether found in high use or low use communities. Those characteristics included:

- having a substantial number of employees driving as part of their job,
- being a large organization with substantial resources,
- often having specific safety managers, or
- having centrally organized administration rather than a network of fairly autonomous departments.

These characteristics could have emerged due to the methods used in selecting employers for interviews, that is, a focus on the largest employers.

ENFORCEMENT

Enforcement efforts were examined for an array of activities and measures. The full list of activities appears in Table 2-6. Activities such as Departmental Belt Use Policy, Belt Non-Use Disincentives, and incentive programs for officers to wear safety belts are similar to those covered in the Employer Support Section. The enforcement and adjudication activities listed in Table 2-6 are described below. Enforcement activities such as safety belt violation citations and written warnings were examined mostly for state and city agencies. County agencies, where they existed, were examined and discovered not to affect significantly the outcome of this section. Of the remaining enforcement activities, safety belt convictions per capita and conviction rates were significantly different between high and low use communities and will be discussed in the next chapter.

Types of Enforcement Activities Observed

Community Outreach

Community outreach mainly consisted of officers making presentations at schools and other public meeting places. Safety belts were often integrated into presentations with topics of child seats, child safety, drinking and driving, and elderly persons driving. Some enforcement agencies, especially State Police division offices, had an officer assigned solely to safety who gave presentations and coordinated other officers' presentations which included safety belts.

Officer Education Efforts

Officer education consisted of presentations to officers in training on the benefits of safety belt wearing for themselves and the public. Both officers in training and present officers received briefings on the enforcement and implementation of laws that made safety belts manatory.

Table 2-6

POTENTIAL ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES EXAMINED FOR THE STUDY OF PROGRAM FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SAFETY BELT USE

Community Outreach
Officer Education Efforts
Departmental Belt Use Policy
Departmental Belt Non-Use Disincentives
Incentive Programs for Officers to Wear Safety Belts
Belt-Use Status on Accident Reports
Written Warnings
Safety Belt Citations
Percentage of Traffic Citations Issued for Safety Belt Violations
Percentage of Total Officers Giving Safety Belt Citations
Per Capita Safety Belt Violations
Per Capita Safety Belt Convictions
Per Capita Moving Violations
Conviction Rates on Safety Belt Citations

Belt Use Status on Accident Reports

Some police departments recorded belt use status on all departmental accident reports and some did not. Some had a formal procedure for releases of that information for each accident. A few were even aggressive in encouraging news reporters to include belt use status in their accident accounts.

The description of belt use status on accident reports varied tremendously in the eight sites. Besides clarity and simplicity of accident report forms, the uniformity of forms throughout the various enforcement agencies increased news reporters' successes in collecting safety belt status information. Having an obvious place on an accident report to find belt wearing status greatly increased reporters' propensity to seek the status than did accident reports requiring in-depth analysis. Also, enforcement agencies that promoted reporting of belt status by the media were more readily received by reporters when the reports or reporting officers mentioned the lives saved and injuries reduced due to safety belts.

Safety Belt Citations

As the structure of the study indicated, four of the communities studied had primary enforcement laws, and four had secondary enforcement laws. Primary enforcement means a law officer can stop a motorist solely because the driver or passenger was not wearing a safety belt. Secondary enforcement means the officer has to stop the motorist for some violation other than safety belt non-use and then cite the driver or passenger for not wearing a safety belt. In some cases, the officer could waive the primary offense and only cite the car occupant for secondary violations including safety belt violations. Only one community of the four with primary enforcement did actually cite safety belt violations as a primary offense. It should be noted that this community had the highest level of safety belt use and the highest increase in safety belt usage of the communities studied.

Some officers expressed hesitation over issuing safety belt citations due to procedural red tape. In some states, mostly secondary enforcement states, officers must cite each violation on a separate ticket. Officers were reluctant to hand a motorist multiple tickets. Many states were phasing out this multiple forms procedure for citing motorists.

Written Warnings

Written warnings are admonishments without fines. Written warnings have the advantage that they can be counted while verbal warnings cannot. In most communities, written warnings were relatively small in number in comparison to safety belt citations. Many of the agencies that gave written warnings were in the process of discontinuing this practice.

Percentage of Traffic Citations Issued for Safety Belt Violations

The percentage of traffic citations issued for safety belt violations was meant to show how much emphasis a department placed on safety belt violators. This activity is discussed further in Chapter 3.

Percentage of Total Officers Giving Safety Belt Citations

This measure showed the difference between enforcement agencies that had traffic patrols and those that did not. Agencies with traffic patrols usually had fewer than 50 percent of their officers writing safety belt citations while agencies without traffic patrols claimed nearly 100 percent of their officers could give safety belt citations. Exceptions to these findings were state enforcement agencies that worked solely on traffic problems and did not provide full service criminal investigations.

Per Capita Safety Belt Violations and per Capita Moving Violations

The per capita measures indicated the likelihood of an individual receiving a citation from police officers. The per capita safety belt violations showed how many people were ticketed for safety belt violations while the per capita moving violations showed the maximum number of people officers ticketed for all traffic offenses. Per capita measures included violations from state and city agencies. In cases where county agencies existed within the eight-community sample, they did not usually perform substantial traffic enforcement functions. These measures are discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

Analysis

Of the seven basic enforcement activities, most local police agencies performed two, some local agencies did three, and a few local agencies did two. Of the seven basic enforcement activities, most state agencies did five, and some state agencies did one. Table 2-7 gives the list of enforcement activities for state and local agencies. Many measures for state and local activities mentioned in Table 2-6 were also examined in this study. The citation rates for safety belt violations showed a statistical difference between higher and lower use communities. The rankings per capita convictions of safety belt violations almost perfectly matched the rankings of communities ordered by increasing usage. More analysis of safety belt conviction rates and per capita convictions will be discussed in Chapter 3.

Table 2-7

ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

Activities	Relative Usage	
	Local Police	State Police
Community Outreach	***	***
Departmental Belt Use Policy	**	***
Departmental Belt Non-Use Policy Disincentives	**	***
Incentives and Internal Education for Officers	**	***
Written Warnings	*	**
Primary Citations	*	
Secondary Citations	***	***

Key:

*** Activities performed in most communities

** Activities performed in about half of the communities

* Activities performed in a few communities

[blank] Activities not performed

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

RELATIVE FREQUENCY OF USE OF ACTIVITIES

Participation in activities for the eight communities varied by activity. For some activities, some person or organization in almost all communities had tried that activity. Other activities did not exhibit as much exposure in the different communities. The exposure and participation of different activities depended on the extent to which the activity was institutionalized, satisfaction gained for those involved the activity's popularity, money available, and many other factors. A discussion of the definitions of frequency of participation follows. Tables 2-8, 2-9, and 2-10 show the different frequencies of participation and also indicates community by community patterns.

Activities Performed in Most Communities

A number of particular activities conducted to promote safety belt use were found in most communities. We found those activities in both the higher belt use and lower belt use communities and therefore concluded that participation in these activities does not help to explain why belt use is higher in some communities and lower in others. Table 2-8 shows which activities were in this category and how many communities participated in each activity. For this discussion, "activities everyone does" are defined as those activities which were reported by at least one contact person in seven or eight of the eight case study communities. Most media and employer support activities, some enforcement activities, and a few community support activities are among them.

The use of these activities appears unrelated to variations in belt use because nearly all the communities studied, both those with higher use and those with lower use, did them. This might have been because they were necessary precursors to community acceptance and law enforcement, because they were easy to do, because they had always been done, because these activities came highly recommended, because the providers got satisfaction from doing them, or for some other reason. At any rate, by virtue of their popularity, these were the activities most likely to continue to be done whether or not they appear to increase belt use.

Table 2-8

ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY MOST CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

Activities	Participating Communities							
	High Use Communities				Low Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Media								
PSAs - Radio	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
PSAs - T.V.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
News Stories - Newspaper	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
News Stories - Radio	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
News Stories - T.V	x	x	x	x	x	na	x	x
Accident Accounts - Newspaper	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Accident Accounts - Radio	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Accident Accounts - T.V.	x	x	x	x	x	x	na	x
Talk Shows - Radio	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
Community Support								
Media Appearances	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Employer Support								
Belt Use Policy - Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Belt Use Policy - Government	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Internal Education - Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Internal Education - Government	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Disincentives - Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Enforcement								
Community Outreach - State Police	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
- Local Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Belt Use Policy - State Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Incentives and Internal Education - State Police	na	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Disincentives - State Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Issuing Secondary Citations	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

na - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Activities Conducted in About Half the Communities

A number of other safety belt promotion activities in all five categories -- media, community support, employer support, PI&E, and enforcement and adjudication -- were conducted in about half the communities. Table 2-9 lists those activities and shows how many communities participated in each activity. This category included those activities reported in three to six of the eight case study communities. The use of these activities seemed unrelated to high or low belt use, with the following exceptions:

- media: paid ads on radio or TV,
- employer support: governmental disincentive program,
- PI&E: films, and
- enforcement: local police activities regarding belt use policies, disincentives, and incentives and internal education.

This study showed measurable statistical differences between high and low belt use communities in terms of the paid ads but not for the other activities; more detailed research should be conducted into the effects of the other activities above. Otherwise, the remaining activites are not likely to be either completely entrenched or effortless, and are thus candidates for possible discontinuance should an evaluation show them not to be significantly associated with increased belt usage.

Activities Used in Few Communities

Some activities used to promote safety belt use were conducted in only a few communities. Their infrequent usage did not permit making significant distinctions between higher and lower use communities. Table 2-10 illustrates the activities in this category and the number of communities reporting their usage. For this discussion, "activities performed in few communities" were defined as those activities which were reported by a contact person in only one or two of the eight communities. One activity from each of the five categories of activities was among them.

The choice of these activities seems unrelated to higher or lower belt use -- but with so few communities currently reporting their use, comparisons were difficult.

Table 2-9

ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY ABOUT HALF THE CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

	Participating Communities							
	High Use Communities				Low Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Media								
PSAs - Newspapers			x			x		x
Paid Ads - Radio	x	x	x	x			x	
- T.V.	x	x	x					x
Talk Shows - T.V.	x	x						x
Community Support								
Distribution of Materials	x		x	x	x		x	x
Directives	x		x		x			x
Loal Coalition Memberships			x				x	x
Lobbying	x		x	x	x	x		
Seminar Attendance			x	x	x		x	x
Employer Support								
Incentive Programs - Corporate				x	x	x	x	x
Disincentive - Government	x	x	x	x	x		x	
P.I.&E								
Billboards, Signs	x	na	x	x	x	na	x	
Brochures, Posters	x	na	x	x		na	x	x
Gimmicks	x	na	x			na	x	x
Classroom Presentations	x	na	x	x	x	na	x	x
Community Displays/		na	x	x	x	na	x	x
Demonstrations		na				na		
Driver's Manual	x	na	x	x	x	na	x	x
Envelope Stuffers	x	na	x			na	x	x
Films	x	na	x	x		na	x	
Newsletters	x	na	x			na	x	x
Enforcement								
Belt Use Policy - Local Police	x	x	x	x	na	na	x	
Disincentives - Local Police	x	na	x	x	na	na	x	
Incentives and Internal Education - Local Police	x	x	x	x	na	x		x
Written Warnings - State Police		x	x			x	x	

na - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Table 2-10

ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY FEW CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

	Participating Communities							
	High Use Communities:				Low Use Communities:			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Media								
Paid Ads - Newspaper						x		
Community Support								
"Saved by the Belt" Testimonials			x					x
Employer Support								
Incentive Programs -- Government			x					
Enforcement								
Issuing Primary Citations - Local Police	x							
Written Warnings - Local Police			x					

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

3

ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH HIGHER BELT USE

Out of the many community activities intended to promote increased safety belt usage examined during this study, three activities distinguished communities reporting higher proportions of the population wearing safety belts from communities reporting lower proportions using safety belts: tailoring and targeting messages to specific audiences, maximizing market penetration, and enforcing belt use laws. While the information gathered here does not specifically prove that adoption of these activities in a community will automatically lead to higher belt use, the combination of their statistical significance and their intuitive appeal would suggest that localities desirous of increasing local belt usage consider undertaking these activities, if possible.

PROVIDING MESSAGES FOR SPECIFIC AUDIENCES

The community's ability and/or willingness to distinguish and target specific audiences or to tailor programs to sub-groups identified within an audience may explain some of the difference in belt usage rates between higher use and lower use communities. Alternatively, it may simply be an indicator of a thoughtful and effective program. In either case, it may be a strategy worth considering at the local level.

Tailoring

Higher belt use communities more often tailored their media programs to fit the demographic influences of language, literacy rates, and special audiences than did lower use communities. Examples of tailoring were found in one of the higher use communities that had educational levels below state and national levels. They emphasized activities using television rather than activities using newspapers. This community program had concentrated on what it perceived its population could best absorb, the visual medium of television. Another example of tailoring was in the higher use community with a large Hispanic population. The program coordinator distributed PSAs and press releases, some in Spanish, some in English, to media providers with large Hispanic audiences, while the lower use community with a large Hispanic population was not able to identify and target the media providers reaching that specific subgroup to provide appropriate materials.

Targeting

Higher use communities reached larger proportions of a particular targeted audience -- employees -- than did lower use communities. In the higher use communities, employees who drove as part of their job were also more specifically targeted. Higher use communities reached larger proportions of this subgroup with each of the eight employer support activities:

- Films
- The "Convincer"
- Seminars
- Signs in Parking Lots
- Stickers, Posters
- Newsletters, Memos
- Paycheck Stuffers
- Employee Driving Courses.

The audience size of each activity was measured by the following proportion using employer estimates and 1984 census data: the number of employees divided by the number of persons in the community's labor force.

MAXIMIZING MARKET PENETRATION

The proportion of the media market reached by particular activities -- PSAs, paid ads, news stories, safety belt status in accident accounts, and talk shows -- through the various media of newspaper, radio or television, explained some of the difference in belt usage rates between higher and lower use communities.

Analysis

The audience size of each activity was measured by the following proportion using numbers collected and summarized by time slot by Arbitron, Inc. during the summer and fall of 1986:

- the number of people over 18 (or number of households) reading/listening/viewing, and
- the total number of people over 18 (or number of households) in the same geographic area.

The proportions found in higher use communities were then statistically compared to the proportions found in lower use communities using a difference of proportions test.

Findings

For the 14 media activities examined (see Table 3-2), the statistical analysis showed the higher use communities reached larger media market shares even though the population sizes of the two groups are very close. The exception was reports of belt usage in newspaper accident accounts. Thus, in the higher use communities, more or possibly higher volume stations and papers were conducting media activities in support of safety belt use than in lower use communities.

Implications

Effective strategies to stimulate increased belt use could include working with media providers to increase the market penetration of safety belt information. This will be easier in certain communities than in others due to differences in media market structures.

Table 3-2

MEDIA ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SAFETY BELT USAGE

Newspapers:	TV Stations:	Radio Stations:
PSAs	PSAs	PSAs
Paid Ads	Paid Ads	Paid Ads
News Stories	News Stories	News Stories
Accident Accounts	Accident Accounts	Accident Accounts
	Talk Shows	Talk Shows

Media Providers

Various providers reach different audience sizes and those sizes may vary depending on the time of day. Traditionally, the late evening news half-hour attracts large audiences. News stories and belt status accident accounts are the activities suited to those time frames. PSAs often play in late night time slots and other time slots that have traditionally small audiences. Radio talk shows and paid ads are more likely to air during the average viewing/listening time from 7 p.m. to midnight. That audience is larger than late night viewers and smaller than the news slot. TV talk shows appear at all hours. Efforts should be made to encourage providers to conduct safety belt activities at times that best fit the station or paper format and maximize audience exposure. A balance should be sought between the number of providers likely to conduct safety belt activities and the number of people each particular provider is likely to reach with particular activities.

Media Market Structure

Because media market structures effect the exposure of safety belt information, it is important to understand how media market structures vary. Some communities tend to have clearly defined markets while others do not. There are two types of defined media markets. In one, the community is clearly the nucleus of the media market and is large enough to maintain national network affiliates. That type of community has national affiliate television and radio stations and a major newspaper. Also, it probably has a population of

at least 90,000. In the other type of clearly defined media market, the community is one of a cluster of similar-sized communities that total over 90,000 in population. In either the city of 90,000 plus or the cluster of cities, a media market is clearly defined if the audience is solely and sufficiently served by the media providers in that area. These situations can be considered instances of a clearly defined media market.

A poorly defined media market is often the result of the overshadowing effects of a much larger city. In some instances, the community of interest may be in what is considered the hinterlands beyond the suburbs of the major city. It may receive television and radio from the major city with little opportunity for input on concerns specific to that community (such as safety belts). In the other instances, a large city media may intrude substantially into the locally established media market with competing national affiliate or cable programming. In either case, the number of stations needed to reach the local audience is greater than in a community of a clearly defined media market.

ENFORCING SAFETY BELT LAWS

Increasing enforcement levels might be another strategy for increasing belt usage in communities. The differences in per capita per month safety belt citations and conviction rates helped explain some of the differences in belt usage rates.

Measures of Enforcement

Convictions Per Capita

Convictions per capita per month (see Table 3-3) showed the likelihood of receiving a safety belt citation and being convicted of that violation in a particular community. Convictions included all safety belt violations for which the fine was paid (whether or not the citation was contested). Convictions per capita showed how actively law officers carried out the enforcement of safety belt laws. For this analysis, the rankings of per capita convictions were compared to the rankings of communities by the amount of increase in safety belt usage, and a strong correlation was found.

Table 3-3

CONVICTIONS FOR SAFETY BELT VIOLATIONS PER CAPITA

Community	Safety Belt Use Increase	Per Capita Per Month Conviction Rate
A	52.5%	.0057104
D	27.1%	.0055790
H	25.9%	.004406
C	23.5%	.00047952
G	23.1%	.0001487
B	22.3%	.0002156
E	10%	N.A.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Conviction Rates

Conviction rates for safety belt violations were the number of safety belt citations for which the fine was paid divided by the total number of safety belt citations. Conviction rates came from exact data, statistical models, and estimates given by both city and State Police. Conviction rates reflected the strength of the law and the support of the law by the local judiciary.

Safety Belt Citations

Safety belt citations were calculated as a percent of all moving traffic violations issued. As shown in Table 3-4, the high belt use groups of communities had much higher percentages of safety belt citations than the low use group.

Overall Data Availability

Tables 3-3 and 3-4 show that communities in the low belt use group were less likely to be able to provide specific data to the research team concerning enforcement activities than the high use group. This lack of ability reflected both a lower level of organization for safety belt activities and, concommitantly, a lower level of priority assigned to safety belt issues.

Analysis

Convictions per capita and conviction rates showed statistically significant relationships to safety belt usage rates. First, rankings of per capita safety belt convictions matched almost exactly the rankings of increases of safety belt usage in each of the communities. Thus, the community with the highest per capita per month number of convictions had the largest increase in safety belt usage. Second, conviction rates were associated with the groups of communities when the rates were tested against higher and lower belt use groups. The safety belt citations as a percent of all moving traffic violations also clearly separated higher and lower belt use communities.

These measures give a simple message: police need to give safety belt citations and judges need to uphold the citations. Communities with higher per capita safety belt convictions had proportionally higher increases in their safety belt usage. The community with the highest belt use increase (52.5%) had a per capita per month conviction rate of .0057104, which is 26 times the per capita per month conviction rate of the community with the lowest belt use increase (22.3%). As shown in Table 3-4, the communities in the higher belt use group had conviction rates ranging from 85 percent to 95 percent while the communities in the lower belt use group had conviction rates ranging from 67 percent to 80 percent.

Officials in two of the communities with lower conviction rates stressed how they wanted to improve the adjudication process. Program directors and coalition members both wanted to encourage judges and others involved in the adjudication to get involved with and informed on safety belt benefits. Enforcement officials also noted that officers did not like to write tickets that did not receive convictions, because conviction rates sometimes reflected on an officer's record. Also, citations often resulted in citizen complaints which caused officers to hesitate in giving citations. Enforcement officials need the backing of judges for motivation and encouragement in the enforcement of the law.

Table 3-4

ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AND BELT USE STATISTICS

	High Belt Use Communities				Low Belt Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Conviction Rate	90%	90%	95%	85%	NA[3]	80%	67%	75%
Safety Belt Citations as a Percentage of Moving Violations	27.5%	1.6%	10.3%	22.6%	NA[3]	1.1%	1.4%	7.2%
Percent of Drivers Wearing Safety Belts[1]	66%	72%	55%	55%	19%	30%	36%	46%
Improvement in Belt Usage Rate by Absolute Percent[2]	52.5%	22.3%	23.5%	27.1%	10%	NA[3]	23.1%	25.9%

[1]Most recent data available at each site; some observations were as recent as July, 1987.

[2]Over the time period spanning just before the enactment of each belt use law to the most recent data available.

[3]NA - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.